

## REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application and the same are rejected. By this Amendment, claims 1, 7, 13, and 17 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1-18 remain in the application and are presented for review and further consideration by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner states that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "elements irresolvable by the printer". (Examiner's Action, page 2, ¶ 2).

In response, Applicant has amended claim 17 to depend on claim 16, which provides an antecedent basis for the limitation "elements irresolvable by the printer".

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 7, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Suzuki, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,606,163. (Examiner's Action, page 3, ¶ 1).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Suzuki discloses attribute data 280a stored in an "object file 209 after a file path name of a spool of each document data has been added to it". Thus, the file path name is the file path name of a spool of document data. (Col. 45, lines 7-11). It is well known in the art of Applicant's invention that a spool is something to which data is sent that puts it into a queue for later processing. A spool of document data is not a file to be delivered from a client to a server for printing. Since the path name in Suzuki is for a spool and a spool is not a file to be delivered from a client to a server for printing, Suzuki does not disclose receiving a path and a name of a file to be delivered from a client to a server for printing.

In contrast, Applicant's independent claims 1, 7, and 13 include wording that a path and a name of a file are received and the preamble of each claim

indicates that the file is a file to be delivered from a client to a server for printing. Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 7, and 13 to more explicitly indicate that the path and name are of a file that is a file to be delivered from a client to a server for printing. Suzuki does not disclose this limitation and therefore, cannot anticipate Applicant's claims.

The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 8, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,606,163, in view of Feuerstein, et al., U.S. Published Application 2002/0083341. (Examiner's Action, page 4, ¶ 3).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 9, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,606,163, in view of Roberts, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,650,431. (Examiner's Action, page 5, ¶ 4).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,606,163, in view of Crandall, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,963,641. (Examiner's Action, page 5, ¶ 5).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner has rejected claims 6, 12, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,606,163, in view of Koppolu, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,268,924. (Examiner's Action, page 7, ¶ 6).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In view of Applicant's arguments and amendments with respect to independent claims 1, 7, and 13 being allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that the remaining dependent claims are also allowable because they contain all

of the limitations of their respective independent claims and further add structural and functional limitations. Furthermore, Applicant finds nothing in Feuerstein, Roberts, Crandall, or Koppolu that cures the noted deficiencies of Suzuki, and claims 1, 7, and 13 are therefore allowable in view of all of these references.

The foregoing amendments and arguments are believed to be a complete response to the most recent Examiner's Action.

No new matter has been added.

It is respectfully submitted that there is no claim, teaching, motivation, or suggestion in any of the prior art cited, alone or in combination, to produce what Applicant claims.

It is further submitted that the application, as amended, defines patentable subject matter and that the claims are in a condition for allowance. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Should any issues remain which would preclude the prompt disposition of this case, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned practitioner by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,  
James S. Boyce

By Mark G. Pannell  
Mark G. Pannell  
Reg. No. 40,761

Date July 20, 2005  
(719) 260-7900